UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/672,627	09/25/2003	Michael K. Martyn	200309767-1	8079

22879 7590 02/02/2007

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER	
VUU, HENRY	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2179	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/02/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/672,627	MARTYN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Henry Vuu	2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *25 September 2003*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-29* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-29* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrison et al. (Patent No. 6,611,725) in view of Dahl et al. (Patent No. 6,557,153).

As to independent claim 1, Harrison et al teaches a method for displaying metadata (see e.g., Fig. 3 and col. 4, lines 37 – 46; i.e., displaying metadata corresponds to attaching annotations to particular edges, vertices, faces, or other model elements visible in a drawing) placed on a document (see e.g., col. 4, lines 37 – 46; i.e., the document corresponds to two dimensional and three dimensional drawing documents in a CAD application), comprising: accepting a command to load a document file that corresponds to the document (see e.g., col. 6, lines 6 – 17; i.e., the CAD software allows the user to reference bolt assembly documents, wherein referencing corresponds to the process of loading a document file) into a memory (see e.g., col. 5, lines 27 – 31; i.e., the CAD software is loaded into storage device 135) of a computing device (see e.g., col. 5, lines 27 –31; i.e., the computing device corresponds to CPU 131); a command (see e.g., col. 5, lines 37 – 38; i.e., the command corresponds to the user actuating the keyboard and mouse to enter and modify the three dimensional model) to assign a label (see e.g., Fig. 3 and col. 4, lines 37 – 40; i.e., the

label corresponds to annotations, such as text notes and dimensional measurements) to each of a plurality of metadata elements (see e.g., Fig.3, col. 4, lines 44 – 46 and col. 5, lines 52 – 55; i.e., metadata elements corresponds to edges, vertices, faces, or other model elements visible in a drawing, for example a bolt 211, a lock washer 212, and a flat washer 213) in the document file (see e.g., Fig. 3 and col. 4, lines 44 – 46; i.e., the document file corresponds to the CAD drawing); displaying at least one of the plurality of metadata elements (see e.g., col. 7, lines 59 – 67 and col. 8, line 1; i.e., "Edge A" and "Edge B" of bolt assembly 210 corresponds to metadata elements, wherein "Edge A" or "Edge B" are displayed to the user when a text-based note is linked to the vertical line image element of "Edge B") in response to a command to display the label (see e.g., col. 2, lines 51 – 58; i.e., displaying the metadata element in response to displaying the label corresponds to receiving user input to select one of the image elements, for example a bolt 211, a lock washer 212, and a flat washer 213 from design tree 260, wherein supplementary data, such as text notes and dimensional measurements are linked with an image element, therefore the command to display supplementary data will also display the image element sequentially) assigned to the at least one of the plurality of metadata elements (see e.g., Fig. 3; i.e., the dimensional measurement label "15.60" is assigned to metadata element "Edge B"), thereby allowing a user to verify a value of the at least one of the plurality of metadata elements (see e.g., Fig. 3; i.e., dimensional measurement label "15.60" assigned to metadata element bolt 211 allows the user to verify the value or dimension of bolt 211); determining that at least a portion of one of the plurality of metadata elements is incorrect (see e.g., col. 8, lines 12 – 28;

i.e., the metadata element corresponds to bolt 211, wherein the user determines that the top surface 223 of bolt 211 is incorrect); and automatically bulk correcting the incorrect metadata elements (see e.g., col. 8, lines 12 – 28; i.e., automatically bulk correcting the metadata element corresponds to reducing the dimension of top surface 223 of bolt 211 in Fig. 3, and transferring the corrections to bolt 211 in Fig. 4 and Fig. 5) by globally repeating the corrections in multiple locations of the document at one time (see e.g., Fig. 3 – 5 and col. 8, lines 12 – 28; i.e., globally repeating the correction corresponds to distributing the reduced dimension of top surface 223 of bolt 211 to associated CAD documents, such as Fig. 4 and Fig. 5) with a batch process (see e.g., Microsoft Computer Dictionary 5th Edition; i.e., a batch process is defined as "a group of documents or data records that are processed as a unit", wherein the dimension correction of top surface 223 of bolt 211 in Fig. 3 will automatically result in a correction in top surface dimension of Fig. 4 and Fig. 5). Harrison et al. does not specifically mention a computer-aided design application accepting input by way of a command line interface. Dahl et al. teaches a computer-aided design application accepting (see e.g., col. 7, lines 33 – 36; i.e., the computer-aided design application corresponds to a programmed computer aided design system) input by way of a command line interface (see e.g., col. 11, lines 32 – 48; i.e., the command line interface corresponds to the ability of a user to enter command line instructions in a GUI, such as constraint language commands). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method for displaying metadata placed on a document of Harrison et al. with the computer-aided design

application accepting input by way of a command line interface of Dahl et al. because the constraint language is intuitive to the user and provides immediate feedback of any changes/corrections (see e.g., col. 11, lines 40 – 48).

As to dependent claim 2, this claim is analyzed with respect to claim 1 as previously discussed above. Harrison et al. teaches the method of claim 1, additionally comprising the step of accepting a command (see e.g., col. 8, lines 12 – 28; i.e., the command to correcting the value of a metadata element corresponds to the user changing the diameter of top surface 223 in document file 261 from "15.60" in Fig. 3 to "4.40" in Fig. 5) to correct the value (see e.g., col. 8, lines 12 – 28; i.e., the metadata element corresponds to bolt 211, wherein the user determines that the top surface 223 of bolt 211 is incorrect, therefore correcting the value of "15.60" in Fig. 3 to "4.40" in Fig. 5) of the at least one of the plurality of metadata elements (see e.g., col. 8, lines 12 – 28; i.e., metadata elements corresponds to edges, vertices, faces, or other model elements visible in a drawing, for example a bolt 211, a lock washer 212, and a flat washer 213).

As to dependent claim 3, this claim is analyzed with respect to claim 2 as previously discussed above. Harrison et al. teaches the method of step 2, wherein the accepting a command (see e.g., col. 8, lines 12 – 28; i.e., the command to correcting the value of a metadata element corresponds to the user changing the diameter of top surface 223 in document file 261 from "15.60" in Fig. 3 to "4.40" in Fig. 5) to correct the value (see e.g., col. 8, lines 12 – 28; i.e., the metadata element corresponds to bolt 211, wherein the user determines that the top surface 223 of bolt 211 is incorrect, therefore

correcting the value of "15.60" in Fig. 3 to "4.40" in Fig. 5) step includes accepting an input generated by the user (see e.g., col. 7, lines 41 – 58; i.e., input generated by the user corresponds to the user activating a procedure for allowing supplementary data to be inputted, through the use of a pointing device or a mouse, wherein supplementary data corresponds to text annotation, dimension measurements, etc.) to correct the value (see e.g., col. 8, lines 12 – 28; i.e., the metadata element corresponds to bolt 211, wherein the user determines that the top surface 223 of bolt 211 is incorrect, therefore correcting the value of "15.60" in Fig. 3 to "4.40" in Fig. 5) of the at least one of the plurality of metadata elements (see e.g., col. 8, lines 12 – 28; i.e., metadata elements corresponds to edges, vertices, faces, or other model elements visible in a drawing, for example a bolt 211, a lock washer 212, and a flat washer 213).

As to dependent claim 4, this claim is analyzed with respect to claim 2 as previously discussed above. Harrison et al. teaches the method of step 2, wherein the accepting a command (see e.g., col. 8, lines 12 – 28; i.e., the command to correcting the value of a metadata element corresponds to the user changing the diameter of top surface 223 in document file 261 from "15.60" in Fig. 3 to "4.40" in Fig. 5) to correct the value step (see e.g., col. 8, lines 12 – 28; i.e., the metadata element corresponds to bolt 211, wherein the user determines that the top surface 223 of bolt 211 is incorrect, therefore correcting the value of "15.60" in Fig. 3 to "4.40" in Fig. 5) includes accepting an input generated by the computing device to correct the at least one of the plurality of metadata elements (see e.g., col. 8, lines 21 – 28; i.e., the correct value "4.40" can be automatically updated in associated documents).

As to dependent claim 6, this claim is analyzed with respect to claim 1 as previously discussed above. Harrison et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the labels assigned to each of the plurality of metadata elements (see e.g., Fig. 3; i.e., dimension annotation 301 is a label assigned to a metadata element, wherein the metadata element corresponds to the top surface 223 of bolt 211) correspond to the value of the plurality of metadata elements (see e.g., Fig. 3; i.e., dimension measurement "15.60" corresponds to the value assigned to top surface 223 of bolt 211).

As to dependent claim 7, this claim is analyzed with respect to claim 1 as previously discussed above. Harrison et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the document is a drawing (see e.g., col. 4, lines 37 – 46; i.e., the document corresponds to two dimensional and three dimensional drawing documents in a CAD application) that describes an article of manufacture (see e.g., col.6, lines 13 – 15; i.e., the article of manufacture corresponds to bolt assembly document 269) corresponding to a mechanical part (see e.g., col. 6, lines 13 – 15; i.e., the mechanical part corresponds to a car door assembly document, wherein the car door assembly document references the bolt assembly document).

As to dependent claim 8, this claim is analyzed with respect to claim 1 as previously discussed above. Harrison et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the document is a drawing (see e.g., col. 4, lines 37 – 46; i.e., the document corresponds to two dimensional and three dimensional drawing documents in a CAD application) that describes an article of manufacture (see e.g., col.6, lines 13 – 15; i.e., the article of manufacture corresponds to bolt assembly document 269) corresponding to one of an

electrical device or a system that performs a computer function (see e.g., col. 6, lines 13 – 15; i.e., it is appreciated to one of ordinary skill in the art that a CAD software is used to construct a two or three dimensional model of non-electrical and electrical devices for manufacturing purposes, wherein one of ordinary skill will appreciate that a car door includes electrical devices, such as opening and closing of a car window through the push of a button).

As to dependent claim 10, this claim is analyzed with respect to claim 1 as previously discussed above. Harrison et al. teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the document (see e.g., Fig. 3 – Fig. 5 and col. 6, lines 13 – 15; i.e., the document corresponds to a bolt assembly document) is generated by the computer-aided design application (see e.g., col. 6, line 8; i.e., CAD system 100).

As to independent claim 12, claim 12 differs from claim 1 only in that claim 12 is an apparatus claim using a computer-readable media (see e.g., col. 9, lines 32 – 65; i.e., EPROM, EEPROM, flash memory, magnetic disks, magneto-optical disks, and CD-ROM disks) containing executable instructions (see e.g., col. 9, lines 56 – 58; i.e., program instructions), when executed by a processor (see e.g., col. 9, lines 36 – 39; i.e., programmable processor) performs the steps of claim 1. Thus, claim 12 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above.

As to dependent claim 13:

Claim 13 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 1, and are respectfully rejected along the same rationale (see e.g., analysis of claim 1; i.e., the command line mode corresponds to a command line interface).

As to dependent claim 14, claim 14 differs from claim 7 only in that claim 14 is an apparatus claim using a computer-readable media (see e.g., col. 9, lines 32 – 65; i.e., EPROM, EEPROM, flash memory, magnetic disks, magneto-optical disks, and CD-ROM disks) containing executable instructions (see e.g., col. 9, lines 56 – 58; i.e., program instructions), when executed by a processor (see e.g., col. 9, lines 36 – 39; i.e., programmable processor) performs the steps of claim 7. Thus, claim 14 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 7 above.

As to dependent claim 16, claim 16 differs from claim 3 only in that claim 16 is an apparatus claim using a computer-readable media (see e.g., col. 9, lines 32 – 65; i.e., EPROM, EEPROM, flash memory, magnetic disks, magneto-optical disks, and CD-ROM disks) containing executable instructions (see e.g., col. 9, lines 56 – 58; i.e., program instructions), when executed by a processor (see e.g., col. 9, lines 36 – 39; i.e., programmable processor) performs the steps of claim 3. Thus, claim 16 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 3 above.

As to dependent claim 17, this claim is analyzed with respect to claim 16 as previously discussed above. Harrison et al. teaches the computing device of claim 16, wherein the document (see e.g., col. 5, lines 58 – 67 and col. 6, lines 1 – 5; i.e., the document corresponds to bolt assembly document 210) includes a plurality of pages (see e.g., Fig. 2A – Fig. 5, col. 5, lines 58 – 67 and col. 6, lines 1 – 5; i.e., the plurality of pages corresponds to bolt document 261, lock washer document 262, and flat washer document 263, wherein all the document pages are associated with label 269, which identifies the highest level of design) that specifies an article of manufacture (see e.g.,

col.6, lines 13 – 15; i.e., the article of manufacture corresponds to bolt assembly document 269), and wherein the display displays the values (see e.g., Fig. 3; i.e., the value corresponds to dimension measurement "15.60") of metadata elements (see e.g., Fig. 3 and col. 8, lines 12 – 28; i.e., metadata elements corresponds to edges, vertices, faces, or other model elements visible in a drawing, for example a bolt 211, a lock washer 212, and a flat washer 213) on one of the plurality of pages (see e.g., Fig. 3; i.e., Fig. 3 is a page associated with bolt assembly document 210) in response to the processor receiving a corresponding command (see e.g., col. 8, lines 12 – 28; i.e., the command to correcting the value of a metadata element corresponds to the user changing the diameter of top surface 223 in document file 261 from "15.60" in Fig. 3 to "4.40" in Fig. 5).

As to independent claim 18:

Claim 18 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 12 and claim 14 above, and are respectfully rejected along the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 19:

Claim 19 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 13, and are respectfully rejected along the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 22, this claim is analyzed with respect to claim 18 as previously discussed above. Harrison et al. teaches the method of claim 18, further comprising displaying the values of at least some of the plurality of metadata elements (see e.g., Fig. 3 and col. 8, lines 3 – 12; i.e., dimension measurement "15.60" is displayed on the GUI, wherein the metadata element corresponds to top surface 223 of

the bolt) in response to receiving a command to display values (see e.g., col. 5, lines 37 – 38; i.e., the command corresponds to the user actuating the keyboard and mouse to display the dimensional measurement of the bolt document 261, wherein the value corresponds to measurement "15.60") corresponding to metadata elements (see e.g., having a certain character string in the assigned label (see e.g., Fig. 2A and col. 5, lines 63 – 67; i.e., bolt document 261, lock washer document 262, and flat washer document 263 are displayed in Fig. 2A's design tree 260, wherein each document has a unique character string as an assigned label).

As to independent claim 23:

Claim 23 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 12, and are respectfully rejected along the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 24:

Claim 24 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 2 and, and are respectfully rejected along the same rationale.

As to independent claim 25:

Claim 25 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 12, and are respectfully rejected along the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 26:

Claim 26 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 2, and are respectfully rejected along the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 29:

Claim 29 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 22, and are respectfully rejected along the same rationale.

Claims 5, 9, 11, 15, 20, 21, 27, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Harrison et al. (Patent No. 6,611,725) in view of Dahl et al. (Patent No. 6,557,153) and in further view of Davis et al. (Patent No. 7,086,028).

As to dependent claim 5, this claim is analyzed with respect to claim 4 as previously discussed. Harrison et al. teaches metadata elements (see e.g., Fig.3, col. 4, lines 44 – 46 and col. 5, lines 52 – 55; i.e., metadata elements corresponds to edges, vertices, faces, or other model elements visible in a drawing, for example a bolt 211, a lock washer 212, and a flat washer 213). Dahl et al. teaches a computer-aided design application accepting (see e.g., col. 7, lines 33 – 36; i.e., the computer-aided design application corresponds to a programmed computer aided design system) input by way of a command line interface (see e.g., col. 11, lines 32 – 48; i.e., the command line interface corresponds to the ability of a user to enter command line instructions in a GUI, such as constraint language commands). Both Harrison et al. and Dahl et al. do not specifically mention the plurality of metadata elements including one or more of a person's name, a revision identifier, and a document title. Davis et al. teaches metadata elements including one or more of a person's name (see e.g., Fig. 2; i.e., information block 204 has metadata elements, such as "Drawn", wherein "Drawn" is associated with a person's name), a revision identifier (see e.g., Fig. 2; i.e., revision history box 206), and a document title (see e.g., Fig. 2; i.e., information block 204 has metadata

elements, such as "Title"). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the metadata element of Harrison et al. with the computer-aided design application accepting input by way of a command line interface of Dahl et al. as modified by a plurality of metadata elements including one or more of a person's name, a revision identifier, and a document title of Davis et al. because the information block 204 and revision block 206 of Davis et al. conveys drawing information and revision history of a design (see e.g., col. 4, lines 40 – 43; i.e., the information 204 and revision block 206 allows the user to easily visualize design information).

As to dependent claim 9, this claim is analyzed with respect to claim 1 as previously discussed above. Harrison et al. teaches displaying metadata elements (see e.g., col. 7, lines 59 – 67 and col. 8, line 1; i.e., "Edge A" and "Edge B" of bolt assembly 210 corresponds to metadata elements, wherein "Edge A" or "Edge B" are displayed to the user when a text-based note is linked to the vertical line image element of "Edge B"). Dahl et al. teaches a computer-aided design application accepting (see e.g., col. 7, lines 33 – 36; i.e., the computer-aided design application corresponds to a programmed computer aided design system) input by way of a command line interface (see e.g., col. 11, lines 32 – 48; i.e., the command line interface corresponds to the ability of a user to enter command line instructions in a GUI, such as constraint language commands). Both Harrison et al. and Dahl et al. do not specifically mention displaying incorrect portions of at least one of the plurality of metadata elements in a manner discernable from correct portions of the at least one of the plurality of metadata elements. Davis et

al. teaches displaying incorrect portions (see e.g., Fig. 3 and col. 5, lines 30 – 35; i.e., displaying incorrect portions of at least one metadata element corresponds to revision history block 306 displaying the initial information of CAD drawing on row 240) of at least one of the plurality of metadata elements (see e.g., Fig. 2 – 3 and col. 3, lines 56 – 59; i.e., the metadata element corresponds to feature 220, wherein feature 320 includes identifier 350 for a user to comprehend a modification of feature 220 has occurred) in a manner discernable from correct portions of the at least one of the plurality of metadata elements (see e.g., Fig. 3 and col. 5, lines 30 – 35; i.e., revision history block 306 contains two rows, row 240 and row 340, wherein the user can use revision history block 306 to comprehend the corrected portions of the CAD drawing. Furthermore, the user can discern correct portions of a metadata element by identifying identifier 350). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the metadata elements of Harrison et al. with the computer-aided design application accepting input by way of a command line interface of Dahl et al. as modified by displaying incorrect portions of at least one of the plurality of metadata elements in a manner discernable from correct portions of the at least one of the plurality of metadata elements of Davis et al. because the information block 204 and revision block 206 of Davis et al. conveys drawing information and revision history of a design (see e.g., col. 4, lines 40 – 43; i.e., the information 204 and revision block 206 allows the user to easily visualize design information).

As to dependent claim 11, this claim is analyzed with respect to claim 1 as previously discussed above. Harrison et al. teaches a plurality of metadata elements

(see e.g., Fig.3, col. 4, lines 44 – 46 and col. 5, lines 52 – 55; i.e., metadata elements corresponds to edges, vertices, faces, or other model elements visible in a drawing, for example a bolt 211, a lock washer 212, and a flat washer 213). Dahl et al. teaches a computer-aided design application accepting (see e.g., col. 7, lines 33 – 36; i.e., the computer-aided design application corresponds to a programmed computer aided design system) input by way of a command line interface (see e.g., col. 11, lines 32 – 48; i.e., the command line interface corresponds to the ability of a user to enter command line instructions in a GUI, such as constraint language commands). Both Harrison et al. and Dahl et al. do not specifically mention placing the plurality of metadata elements within a table on the document. Davis et al. teaches placing a plurality of metadata elements within a table (see e.g., Fig. 2 – Fig. 3 and col. 4, lines 31 – 43; i.e., the metadata elements within a table corresponds to but not limited to the documents title, scale, drawing number, and etc.) on the document (see e.g., Fig. 2 – Fig. 3; i.e., the drawing information block 204 and revision history block 206 are tables placed on a CAD drawing document, wherein the document corresponds to drawing 200). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the plurality of metadata elements of Harrison et al. with the computer-aided design application accepting input by way of a command line interface of Dahl et al. as modified by placing a plurality of metadata elements within a table of Davis et al. because the information block 204 and revision block 206 of Davis et al. conveys drawing information and revision history of a design (see e.g.,

col. 4, lines 40 – 43; i.e., the information 204 and revision block 206 allows the user to easily visualize design information).

As to dependent claim 15, claim 15 differs from claim 5 only in that claim 15 is an apparatus claim using a computer-readable media (see e.g., col. 9, lines 32 – 65; i.e., EPROM, EEPROM, flash memory, magnetic disks, magneto-optical disks, and CD-ROM disks) containing executable instructions (see e.g., col. 9, lines 56 – 58; i.e., program instructions), when executed by a processor (see e.g., col. 9, lines 36 – 39; i.e., programmable processor) performs the steps of claim 5. Thus, claim 15 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 5 above.

As to dependent claim 20, this claim is analyzed with respect to claim 18 as previously discussed above. Harrison et al. teaches a computing device (see e.g., col. 5, line 14; i.e., CPU 131) used to execute a computer-aided design application (see e.g., col. 5, line 27; i.e., the computer-aided design application corresponds to CAD software) for developing a document that describes an article of manufacturer (see e.g., col.6, lines 13 – 15; i.e., the article of manufacture corresponds to bolt assembly document 269). Dahl et al. teaches a computer-aided design application accepting (see e.g., col. 7, lines 33 – 36; i.e., the computer-aided design application corresponds to a programmed computer aided design system) input by way of a command line interface (see e.g., col. 11, lines 32 – 48; i.e., the command line interface corresponds to the ability of a user to enter command line instructions in a GUI, such as constraint language commands). Both Harrison et al. and Dahl et al. do not specifically mention ignoring predefined portions of the incorrect metadata elements for documents that are

revisions and identifying predefined portions of the incorrect metadata elements for documents that are to be released version. Davis et al. teaches ignoring (see e.g., Fig. 3 and col. 5, lines 20 – 34; i.e., ignoring corresponds to revision history block 306 creating a second row for revised portions of the metadata elements, wherein the first row is ignored in order to allow the user to visually comprehend the history of the CAD drawing) predefined portions of the incorrect metadata elements for documents that are revisions (see e.g., Fig. 2 – Fig. 3; i.e., the incorrect metadata elements for documents that are revisions corresponds to revision history block 306 containing the initial information of the original CAD drawing, wherein incorrect portions of metadata elements remain in revision history block 306) and identifying predefined portions of the incorrect metadata elements (see e.g., Fig. 3; i.e., revision history block 306 is displayed on the CAD drawing for the user to identify portions of incorrect metadata and modifications made to the CAD drawing) for documents that are to be released version (see e.g., Fig. 3 and col. 5, lines 20 – 34; i.e., revision history block 306 contains modification field 233, wherein the description used for the first row corresponds "Initial Release" of the first CAD drawing). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the computing device used to execute a computer-aided design application for developing a document that describes an article of manufacturer, including a plurality of metadata elements of Harrison et al. with the computer-aided design application accepting input by way of a command line interface of Dahl et al. as modified by ignoring predefined portions of the incorrect metadata elements for documents that are revisions and identifying predefined

portions of the incorrect metadata elements for documents that are to be released version of Davis et al. because the information block 204 and revision history block 306 of Davis et al. conveys drawing information and revision history of a design (see e.g., col. 4, lines 40 – 43; i.e., the information 204 and revision block 206 allows the user to easily visualize design information).

As to dependent claim 21:

Claim 21 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 9, and are respectfully rejected along the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 27, this claim is analyzed with respect to claim 25 as previously discussed above. Harrison et al. teaches metadata elements are only labeled in predefined areas of the document (see e.g., Fig. 2A and col. 5, lines 63 – 67; i.e., bolt document 261, lock washer document 262, and flat washer document 263 are displayed in Fig. 2A's design tree 260, wherein the predefined area corresponds to design tree 260, which each metadata document has a unique character string as an assigned label), wherein the metadata elements comprises dimensional data and informational data about the document (see e.g., Fig. 3 and col. 8, lines 3 – 12; i.e., bolt document 261 includes dimensional data, such as "15.60", and informational data about the document, such as supplementary data stored in the drawing file). Dahl et al. teaches a computer-aided design application accepting (see e.g., col. 7, lines 33 – 36; i.e., the computer-aided design application corresponds to a programmed computer aided design system) input by way of a command line interface (see e.g., col. 11, lines 32 – 48; i.e., the command line interface corresponds to the ability of a user to enter

command line instructions in a GUI, such as constraint language commands). Both Harrison et al. and Dahl et al. do not specifically mention the computing device further includes ignoring predefined portions of the incorrect metadata elements for documents that are revisions and identifying predefined portions of the incorrect metadata elements for documents that are to be released versions. Davis et al. teaches ignoring (see e.g., Fig. 3 and col. 5, lines 20 – 34; i.e., ignoring corresponds to revision history block 306 creating a second row for revised portions of the metadata elements, wherein the first row is ignored in order to allow the user to visually comprehend the history of the CAD drawing) predefined portions of the incorrect metadata elements for documents that are revisions (see e.g., Fig. 2 – Fig. 3; i.e., the incorrect metadata elements for documents that are revisions corresponds to revision history block 306 containing the initial information of the original CAD drawing, wherein incorrect portions of metadata elements remain in revision history block 306) and identifying predefined portions of the incorrect metadata elements (see e.g., Fig. 3; i.e., revision history block 306 is displayed on the CAD drawing for the user to identify portions of incorrect metadata and modifications made to the CAD drawing) for documents that are to be released version (see e.g., Fig. 3 and col. 5, lines 20 – 34; i.e., revision history block 306 contains modification field 233, wherein the description used for the first row corresponds "Initial Release" of the first CAD drawing). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate labeling metadata elements in a predefined area of the document, wherein the metadata elements comprises dimensional data and informational data about the document of

Harrison et al. with the computer-aided design application accepting input by way of a command line interface of Dahl et al. as modified by ignoring predefined portions of the incorrect metadata elements for documents that are revisions and identifying predefined portions of the incorrect metadata elements for documents that are to be released version of Davis et al. because the information block 204 and revision history block 306 of Davis et al. conveys drawing information and revision history of a design (see e.g., col. 4, lines 40 – 43; i.e., the information 204 and revision block 206 allows the user to easily visualize design information).

As to dependent claim 28:

Claim 28 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 21, and are respectfully rejected along the same rationale.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Prior art Publication No. 2004/0225390 can be applicable and pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Prior art disclosed by Keller et al. discloses a CAD software for modeling an article of manufacturer, wherein each part used to create a model contains metadata elements.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 - 29 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Henry Vuu whose telephone number is (571) 270-1048. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on (571) 272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Henry Vuu

1/25/2007

BA HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER